

EXHIBIT B

STATE OF TEXAS           )  
                              ) ss  
COUNTY OF DALLAS       )

AFFIDAVIT OF PETER P. GUGGINA

Peter P. Guggina, being duly sworn and under oath deposes and states as follows:

1. I am employed by MCI Telecommunications Corporation as the Director of Technical Standards Management. My office address is 2400 N. Glenville Drive, Richardson, Texas 75082. In this capacity, I am responsible for managing a staff that plans, coordinates and executes MCI's participation in the industry forums and standards process. My position provides a daily view of the status and events that take place in these arenas. In addition to participating directly in and monitoring other MCI participants' progress, I am in constant contact with other industry participants in an attempt to resolve issues and to make the process more effective.

2. I am also my company's representative to the Board of Directors of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS),<sup>1/</sup> formerly the Exchange Carrier Standards Association (ECSA), which sponsors many telecommunications standards setting bodies and industry forums. In addition, I

---

<sup>1/</sup> ATIS's stated mission is to promote the timely resolution of national and international issues involving telecommunications standards and the development of operational guidelines.

am also MCI's representative to the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). I also serve as Vice-chair to the Carrier Liaison Committee (CLC),<sup>2/</sup> which provides oversight management of the ATIS/CLC forums. Further, I am Chairman of the Interexchange Carrier Industry Committee ("ICIC"), an industry group that reviews technical subject matters associated with exchange access services. Chairing the ICIC provides me additional exposure to a cross section of industry activities related to the forum and standards process. My involvement with these industry activities began in 1984, and I have over 20 years of telecommunications operation, engineering, and network planning experience.

3. I am submitting this Affidavit in connection with the FCC's proceedings in Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services, Docket No. 95-20.

4. Enhanced services markets will be strongly affected by the technical standards that define whether and how various public switched telephone network features and services are made available to enhanced service providers (ESPs). Quite simply, these standards, and the implementation thereof, will

---

<sup>2/</sup> The CLC's stated mission is to provide interindustry mechanisms for the discussion and voluntary resolution of nationwide concerns regarding the provision of exchange access and telecommunications network interconnection. The CLC is an umbrella organization for the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF), the Network Operations Forum (NOF) and the Industry Carriers Compatibility Forum (ICCF).

determine how and when ESPs can connect in a uniform manner with the telephone network and, therefore, can be of life or death business consequence for those firms.

5. These technical standards are not set by regulatory agencies. Rather, they are developed through industry forums and standards committees. The forums and committees consist of both the telephone companies and firms that want to connect to the telephone network. Of necessity, the Regional Bell Operating Companies ("RBOCs") are major players in these forums and committees. When the RBOCs participate in these bodies as both monopoly providers of network services and competing providers of enhanced services, they have the incentive and the ability to use their power to influence decisions and resolutions that will favor their own enhanced service operations over those of non-RBOC providers. These bodies develop voluntary standards and industry solutions to problems relating to network interconnection with local exchange carriers (LECs), interexchange carriers (IXCs), ESPs and equipment vendors. Generally, the standards committees develop uniform architectures, protocols and interfaces, and the forums develop technical and operational solutions to industry issues associated with the provision and implementation of exchange access.

6. In this Affidavit, I will discuss several ways in which the RBOCs and Bellcore control or delay the outcome of

issues worked under the ATIS structure.

**I. The RBOCs and Bellcore Can Control Enhanced Services Development Through Dominance of the Industry Standards and Forum Process**

7. The degree of access to RBOC unbundled services and network components will be determined by the willingness of the RBOCs to reach agreements at the industry forums and to implement those agreements. The forum which was thought to affect to a large degree how enhanced services will be delivered to the market is the Information Industry Liaison Committee (IILC).<sup>3/</sup> The IILC is a committee under the sponsorship of ATIS. MCI, as a provider of enhanced services, and many ESPs have participated in IILC activities since its inception. However, the results of many years of effort have not yielded many tangible results. In fact, in the area of open access, unbundled network components are still not available. While the IILC has produced some high level unbundling documents, (e.g., Issue #026, Long Term Unbundling and Network Evolution) which have reached initial closure, there is no indication or assurance of when an unbundled network will be available, if ever. Issue #026, which has taken over four years of intensive discussion and work by a large task group of the IILC, is not a technical specification, but rather a high level study to examine the

---

<sup>3/</sup>The Information Industry Liaison Committee serves as an interindustry mechanism for the discussion and voluntary resolution of industry-wide concerns about the provision of Open Network Architecture (ONA) services and related matters.

technical and operational problems and assess their scope and possible solutions. Hence, additional technical, operational, etc. specifications remain to be developed. In addition, a long list of public policy issues have been identified, some of which are not related to unbundling and appear to be nothing more than RBOC tactical hurdles to avoid taking action. This will further confuse resolution of the issues and prolong the true implementation of open access and network unbundling. In order to bring such unbundling scenarios into reality, the RBOCs would have to solve the associated problems and perform those actions necessary for implementation.

8. The serial nature of the industry forum, standards and Bellcore processes assures that RBOC networks will not be unbundled in the foreseeable future, even if positive agreements are reached along the way, unless a regulatory mandate is imposed for a date certain or an incentive is created. The IILC issue #026 document is being "sliced" into small pieces. If the piece parts are referred to standards committees and other industry forums to work on developing additional and related industry agreements, as the RBOCs have proposed, the industry forums and standards process can take many more years, and implementation may never become a reality. It is likely that the IILC's unbundled access points document will dissipate once it is sliced into small pieces and referred to other industry forums and standards committees.

9. In its March 1995 filing in Docket 95-20, GeoNet referred to flaws in the IILC process, based on their experience with IILC Issue #044. This issue involved access to the Local Exchange Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN) by a Non-LEC switching device. GeoNet cites problems with (1) IILC issue acceptance, (2) the voluntary nature of participation, which has led to very little input from RBOC participants and (3) issue resolution consensus. Further, GeoNet claims that these flaws will severely limit the effectiveness of the IILC in resolving uniformity issues relating to new technology. MCI shares GeoNet's concerns, and believes that the problem is not as much with the IILC as it is with the strategies and objectives of RBOC participants.

10. From my experience, this situation is not limited to the IILC. Issues originated by ESPs and presented to the forum are frequently altered by RBOC participants.<sup>4/</sup> Hence, the scope and intent of the issues are changed in order to gain RBOC support in working the issue. So, when forum work begins, the issue under study may have little relevance to the issue originally brought to the Committee. This tactic can be used to make it more difficult to later seek regulatory or other forms of relief, since the original scope and intent are

---

<sup>4/</sup> The industry forums utilize a formal process of issue introduction. Issue statements are utilized to define the problem to be solved. Also, the originator states a desired outcome.

not documented. So, time is wasted working on issues which do not meet the needs of the ESP originators, which results in delay.

11. MCI is supporting changes in the IILC process aimed at making the process more efficient, certain, and less costly. However, improving procedures alone will not correct the problems. To correct the problems, the RBOCs must proactively pursue solutions to ESPs needs, i.e. true unbundling. Typically, the RBOCs claim that progress is slowed because the ESPs have not submitted enough "technical contributions," i.e., technical papers. However, that excuse is a red herring to divert attention from the RBOCs' own inaction and unwillingness to provide solutions. The RBOCs need to listen to ESP needs and provide comprehensive contributions to resolve the issues.

12. Even if GeoNet succeeded in getting its issue accepted as it originally intended and subsequently resolved, this would not assure that the RBOCs would agree to implement the solution. If the RBOCs did agree, they could direct Bellcore to create or change the appropriate technical documents, e.g., Bellcore "Technical References" and "Generic Requirements". Such changes could be brought into standards committees, if and when needed, and given to vendors to



develop.<sup>5/</sup>

13. The RBOCs use tactics of slicing issues into small pieces, forum shopping, changing the originator's issue statement and objective, dominating the consensus process, and prolonging discussion and studying issues instead of taking focused actions. And when they have exhausted their delay tactics, they simply do not implement agreements, as such agreements are voluntary.

14. In addition, in many cases, the resolutions of IILC issues contain language which specifies an investigation of a particular request rather than the implementation thereof. Such studies and investigations may be appropriate in some instances, but do not provide any certainty of delivery of unbundled interfaces.

15. A better approach, which would provide a level of certainty, would be to simply require the RBOCs to cooperate and expedite network unbundling. I cannot identify a technical

---

<sup>5/</sup> There have been preliminary reports of a possible sale or spin-off of Bellcore by the RBOCs. As a practical matter, such a sale is not likely to have much of an impact on the processes described herein, since the RBOCs could still coordinate among themselves just as easily and would still exercise dominance over these processes through their own representatives in the relevant industry committees, forums and associations and through their enormous purchasing power. Moreover, the RBOCs would likely be Bellcore's most significant customers, thereby continuing their strong influence on Bellcore.

or operational reason that would prevent the RBOCs from carrying out fundamental unbundling by engaging Bellcore to write technical requirements to implement the IILC issues as well as broader unbundled interfaces based on a clear set of objectives and timelines. Without a clear requirement, however, the industry will be subjected to a costly and uncertain discussion and paper-creating activity instead of true unbundling.

**II. The RBOCs Can Effectively Use the Forums and Standards Process to Stall Developments and Implementations That Are Not Part of Their Plans**

16. ATIS in its former structure (ECSA) was 100% LEC. The LEC membership criteria restriction was lifted and non-LEC industry entities were given eligibility for membership. However, it is a numerical fact that the LECs' interests remain in control. The ATIS profile reveals that 92% of its member companies are LECs, the board of directors is 82% LEC, and the officers were appointed mainly from the LEC ranks.

17. Despite the ATIS motto of doing what is best for the industry rather than putting a corporate interest first, the fact is that the LEC predominance in the ATIS membership and board continues to strongly influence its undertakings. In addition to the board and officers, most of the key ATIS staff also have been hired from the LEC industry. A meeting was recently held between the ATIS board of directors and representatives of the Internet Society for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of both organizations. One of

the Internet representatives asked if ATIS was involved in lobbying on policy issues. Mr. Sczypczak, the ATIS Chairman, promptly replied, "No, we do that in USTA". Mr. Sczypczak apparently overlooked the fact that USTA is a LEC association and is heavily involved in lobbying for MFJ relief, among other contentious issues, and many of the minority ATIS members are opposed to MFJ relief until certain conditions are met. Hence, it has been my experience that while ATIS membership has been "opened", its thinking continues to be strongly influenced by its LEC roots. This is not to deny that much of its work is well intended and that its staff does in fact work very diligently towards solving the industry's problems. However, it cannot be overlooked that the RBOCs do in fact enjoy a dominant position in these industry activities and heavily participate in the management of ATIS, which significantly influences its direction.

18. The RBOCs, through their ability to dominate and control consensus, have been able to postpone the delivery of new service capabilities and thus prevent access purchasers from offering new features based on those new capabilities. For example, since 1987 the RBOCs have placed various hurdles in the standards process and in the industry forums to delay access customers interested in using additional Signaling System Number 7 (SS7) signaling capabilities. One such capability would enable a LEC to pass the Carrier Identification Code (CIC) to an IXC via SS7 in an originating

Feature Group D access configuration. Passing the CIC would allow IXCs, for example, to provision universal trunk groups, thus eliminating the need to segregate traffic to identify service or reseller traffic usage. In addition, passing the CIC would allow IXCs to perform CIC-based routing and develop new services that would use the CIC as a call processing or billing mechanism trigger.

19. MCI and other IXCs have been forced to overcome one obstacle after another in obtaining this capability. MCI requested a CIC delivery mechanism as far back as 1987, when commenting on Bellcore technical documentation concerning SS7 interconnection. At the Industry Carriers Compatibility Forum (ICCF), MCI and other IXCs supplied comments to Bellcore's interLATA SS7 interface specifications (what eventually became TR-TSV-000905 and now known as FR-NWT-000905). MCI's request was for the SS7 Transit Network Selection (TNS) parameter, which contained the CIC information, to be made available as an orderable option for domestic calls, in addition to the existing requirement for international calls. The RBOCs' response, however, was that the issue would need to be worked in T1<sup>6/</sup> standards. Then, when MCI brought the issue to the standards body in 1988,<sup>2/</sup> the RBOCs would only consider

---

<sup>6/</sup> Committee T1 is an ANSI-accredited standards committee for the development and coordination of North American telecommunications standards.

<sup>2/</sup> MCI made a formal request to the SS7 signaling working group, T1S1.3, via contribution T1S1.3/88-07521, that the TNS  
(continued...)

methods of CIC delivery that were more complex than using the TNS parameter. The RBOCs exercised their dominance over the standards committee to permit only the development of a new parameter instead, the Carrier Identification Parameter (CIP). MCI and the other IXCs were thereby forced to accept this new CIP parameter in place of the TNS parameter. The process of developing this new parameter alone has effectively delayed providing a CIC-delivery capability because implementation would now require every SS7 switch to generate and recognize the new parameter, as opposed to modifying an existing signaling element. It was yet another RBOC hurdle created in order to make the provision of this capability more complex to implement, thereby leading to the effective denial of the IXCs' request.

20. The next hurdle in the process was to return to the ICCF and request the RBOCs to provide implementation information. Although the technical description had been stable for some time, the RBOCs initially refused<sup>8/</sup> to provide implementation information, stating that the standards activity was still in progress, that a prioritization of capabilities

---

<sup>7/</sup> (...continued)

parameter be passed unconditionally between the local and interexchange networks. MCI's contributions T1S1.3/89-03521 and T1S1.3/98-09504 described the use of a new SS7 parameter for delivery of CIC information.

<sup>8/</sup> MCI requested an exchange carrier report at ICCF meeting #20 in August, 1990 to provide implementation details concerning CIP which was included in the ANSI issue 2 draft ISUP standard. There had been no technical challenges against CIP which could have suggested that technical issues existed.

was required and an assessment of costs and availability was needed before any response could be provided. RBOC responses at a subsequent ICCF meeting provided little assurance that RBOCs were addressing this issue. In fact, several RBOCs stated that the standards process was still unresolved. Other comments ranged from there being no available vendor information to concerns over technical requirements not being available. Other RBOC responses questioned the IXCs' desire for the capability, despite all of the IXCs present expressing their desire and support for the CIP capability.

21. Seven years of persistent effort have elapsed in pursuit of CIP delivery. This includes an extensive tour of the forums, standards committees, Bellcore's requirements process, and one-on-one meetings. However, CIP delivery still has not been made available and there are no certain implementation timelines. This is a sad commentary since it could have been a minor addition to the original SS7 signaling protocol and could have been available with the initial SS7 roll out.

22. Another example of how the RBOCs can effectively use the forums and standards process to delay service capabilities to other entities is with 555 access arrangements. MCI and other entities, including ESPs, requested and received 555-XXXX line numbers from the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) in June, 1994. This followed over twelve

months of intensive work by the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) to develop assignment guidelines for the 555 resource.

23. The RBOCs waited<sup>2/</sup> until after the assignment guidelines were complete to consider development of the access arrangements. It was only after the assignments were made by NANPA that it became publicly known that the RBOCs apparently did not have and were not yet developing the technical means to route, screen, and bill 555 calls. The industry is now developing access arrangements. But, access customers and ESPs who have numbers assigned are currently forced to consider differing, varying and undesirable technical approaches from the RBOCs. It should be noted that the RBOCs already have their own 555 applications and routing in place. Because of the RBOCs' failure to disclose their inability to provide 555 access arrangements, MCI and other IXC's as well as ESPs have been delayed in implementing new services.

24. A similar example of where MCI has encountered RBOC delay strategies in offering new service features and capabilities concerns a national abbreviated dialing plan. BellSouth, in particular, which introduced and co-sponsored development of abbreviated dialing capabilities for over two

---

<sup>2/</sup> Telco Planning introduced the issue of the development of 555 access arrangements to the IILC in February, 1994 as Issue #046 and to the ICCF in March, 1994 as Issue #277.

years at the IILC,<sup>10/</sup> initially supported MCI's concept of developing a national abbreviated dialing plan at the Industry Numbering Committee (INC).<sup>11/</sup> Then, after co-sponsoring the issue at the IILC and six months after supporting the issue when introduced at the INC, BellSouth explicitly withdrew their support<sup>12/</sup> for the capability. Hence, BellSouth's withdrawal of support has delayed progress on the development of new service opportunities and puts in jeopardy the development of an abbreviated dialing plan.

25. Other RBOCs have opposed abbreviated dialing plan development for reasons ranging from inadequate numbering resources being available to meet industry demand (Bell Atlantic), to there being inadequate demand for such resources (NYNEX). BellSouth has asserted its wish to assign abbreviated codes for use in its own territory and therefore would not need a national plan, which would afford it less control of the resource. RBOC sponsorship and support of this issue in both the IILC and the INC has misled ESPs and other carriers interested in the development of abbreviated dialing capabilities, by initially causing them to believe that

---

<sup>10/</sup> BellSouth's issue was introduced into the IILC on April 23, 1992 (Issue #036), requesting developments of abbreviated dialing access.

<sup>11/</sup> BellSouth's June 1, 1994 contribution to the INC stated support for the plan. MCI's July, 1994 contribution to the INC also stated support for the plan.

<sup>12/</sup> BellSouth's December 13, 1994 contribution to the INC stated opposition to the plan.



implementation was a realistic expectation.

26. Another example of RBOC actions that have misled their customers is in the area of telecommunications fraud prevention matters. The Network Operations Forum (NOF) has, as one of its standing committees, the Toll Fraud Prevention Committee (TFPC). The TFPC has been discussing the fraud prevention issues arising from call forwarding for two years, generating much attention from both IXC's and LEC's.

27. These deliberations appeared to have resulted in TFPC recommendations that addressed the call forwarding fraud problems. While the TFPC was conducting its deliberations, however, the RBOCs were filing tariffs that did not address the fraud risks, and since then, two RBOCs -- including Pacific Bell, whose representative on the TFPC is the co-chair -- submitted tariffs ignoring the TFPC recommendations. In response, the IXC's have found it necessary to oppose the tariffing of this service. Thus, the efficiency and "good faith negotiation" utility of the industry forum process is questionable, at best. It is difficult, if not impossible, to understand what rationale exists for such an approach, other than an RBOC strategy to delay closure of issues, or delay saying no. It is evident that even after two years of TFPC discussions, the RBOCs apparently have no intention of supporting the agreements they made in the TFPC.

28. These dynamics are not limited to the domestic standards arena. The RBOCs can also influence the international standards process. For example, the U.S. position to the International Telecommunications Union (ITU-T) is disproportionately influenced by the RBOCs, through their ability to dominate the consensus process at Committee T1, which originates many of the U.S. contributions to the ITU-T.

29. A specific example illustrates how the RBOCs can impede those who espouse positions inconsistent with their strategies and plans. International carriers, including MCI, have been actively working to advance the standardization of a capability called Global Virtual Network Service (GVNS) in the ITU-T. The GVNS service will provide a global standard procedure and protocol at the international interface to facilitate interconnections of carrier specific, virtual private network services between countries. The RBOCs are not currently international carriers, and thus one would expect that they would have a neutral position on the development of GVNS capabilities. However, the exact opposite is true, with the RBOCs and Bellcore having argued at T1 against the positions of international carriers, such as MCI and AT&T, who were attempting to develop proposed positions to the U.S. State Department. The RBOCs and Bellcore succeeded in delaying GVNS technical contributions several times in Committee T1 standards

from going forward as U.S. positions<sup>13/</sup> to ITU-T.

30. The RBOCs' dominance of standards and forums is further facilitated through another industry association, the United States Telephone Association (USTA). The USTA structure affords the RBOCs the opportunity to collectively plan and discuss their positions concerning industry technology, numbering resources, network operations, administration and LEC services. Then, the USTA position is carried into the industry standards and forum meetings, where the USTA position, while touted as being made on behalf of all local exchange carriers, is essentially another RBOC voice.

**III. The RBOCs Are Able To Numerically Dominate The Industry Standards and Forum Process Through Leadership Positions and By Attendance**

31. The RBOCs dominate leadership positions in the standards and forum process. Per the T1 Officers Directory, January 20, 1995, the RBOCs held 36 leadership positions, and the IXC's held 14. Of these positions, there are 14 RBOC chairs and only 2 IXC chairs. As a result, the RBOCs have the ability to steer events toward an outcome which is consistent with their business interests. The RBOCs also dominate the standards and forums process through attendance.

---

<sup>13/</sup> The RBOC and Bellcore position concerning the GVNS standard was to attempt to force the use of the E.164 numbering plan in the service description. International providers required a network specific numbering plan to identify the carrier for routing purposes.

32. The RBOCs' domination by numbers is particularly effective at T1's working group meetings, because decisions reached at these working groups are determined by the attendees' "consensus." The working groups are subcommittees tasked by T1 to resolve most of the technical issues arising in the standards process. The RBOCs and Bellcore in this environment are able to effectively delay or prevent standards development, or drive their own objectives at the working group level by the sheer number of representatives they send to meetings.<sup>14/</sup> In addition, the RBOCs are benefited by the additional voices in attendance at these meetings through the representatives of their associations.<sup>15/</sup> Their massive collective purchasing power also permits them to influence positions taken by vendors.

33. By contrast, decisions on leadership and standards approval are made by a vote of member companies at the governing technical subcommittee T1 and T1 advisory levels

---

<sup>14/</sup> For example, the following numbers are representative of traditional attendance levels at standards meetings. In a sample of working group meetings from 1987 to present, the RBOCs provided, on average, nearly 3 times the number of attendees to each meeting throughout the period as the IXC's. The T1S1.3 working group meeting in October 1988 had five times the number of RBOC attendees (39 representatives) to each IXC attendee (7 IXC representatives). The T1S1.1 working group meeting in July 1994 had 24 RBOC and 4 IXC representatives. The T1S1 meeting in October 1994 had 13 RBOC and 7 IXC representatives. It should also be noted that it is not uncommon for Bellcore attendees alone to outnumber the IXC's (e.g., T1S1.3 working group in July 1989 had 8 Bellcore attendees but only 6 IXC attendees).

<sup>15/</sup> USTA and National Exchange Carrier Association (NECA) are examples.

rather than by consensus. However, even with voting by member companies at these levels, it is both very difficult and time consuming to change the outcome, because the consideration and resolution of concerns are sent back to the working group meetings, where RBOC dominance can control the outcome. The RBOCs do not dominate committee T1 with their voting memberships. However, their leadership positions, industry affiliation, and Bellcore ownership provide the dynamics to dominate the outcome of what happens and what is prevented from happening.

34. The ability of the RBOCs to dominate industry meetings<sup>16/</sup> is amplified within the industry forums, where the resolution of issues is determined solely by consensus without an accompanying voting process. Thus, the result is that ESPs have limited opportunity to influence the outcome of issues in the forums and in standards. If the RBOCs do not want something to happen, it does not happen.

#### **IV. The Bellcore Requirements Process is Also Subject to Abuse By the RBOCs**

---

<sup>16/</sup> For example, the following numbers are representative of traditional attendance levels at industry forums. In a sample of NOF, ICCF, INC and CLC meetings, the RBOCs provided, on average, greater than twice the number of attendees to each meeting as the IXC's. In March 1995, the NOF #47 general session meeting had 20 RBOC and 5 IXC representatives. In March 1991 the ICCF #22 meeting had 36 RBOC and 14 IXC representatives. In November 1994, the ICCF #33 meeting had 16 RBOC and 8 IXC representatives. In March 1995, the INC meeting had 12 RBOC and 5 IXC representatives. At the February 1995 CLC meeting, all 7 RBOCs, two independent LECs and USTA were represented, but only three IXC's were present.

35. Not only are the RBOCs able to delay the development and implementation of capabilities and control, by their dominance, the outcomes within the consensus process, but they are also able to control the development of technical specifications, which direct their equipment suppliers.

36. Bellcore's generic requirements,<sup>17/</sup> now referred to as "GR-CORE", accompanied by their corresponding Issues Lists Reports (ILRs), have not addressed the concerns of ESPs. The Bellcore requirements process presents a significant obstacle to the orderly provision of new services. This is because, despite industry standards and forum agreements, there is no assurance that such agreements will be incorporated into the technical specification that is developed by Bellcore on behalf of its owners, the RBOCs. Further exacerbating the problem is the Bellcore disclaimer contained in each technical publication stating that each Bellcore client may make changes in any portion of the specification. Thus, an ESP may never know with any degree of certainty whether a standard or industry forum agreement will be implemented, or be implemented in the same manner across all access networks. In contrast, the RBOCs have a robust infrastructure for coordinated planning through their Bellcore, USTA and other national services coordinating groups. They selectively use these groups when they want to make something happen and when they do not.

---

<sup>17/</sup> Previously, Bellcore used a Technical Advisory (TA) and Technical Requirement (TR) process to interact with industry and the vendor community.

37. Bellcore claims that its new generic requirements process provides an opportunity for industry to have input into the requirements process and avoids unnecessary problems associated with capability development.<sup>18/</sup> Bellcore refers to this as an early interaction process, where equipment suppliers and users, such as ESPs, could participate in the document development process by providing input. In reality, this input from other entities carries only the weight that the RBOCs collectively decide to attach, and affords no commitment by Bellcore or the RBOCs to include such input in the technical specifications. It is the RBOCs alone that determine approval of what is or what is not contained in these Bellcore de-facto standards documents.

38. The generic requirements process is essentially the RBOCs' private standards setting process run by Bellcore to circumvent the industry standards or forum arenas. It provides a continuous opportunity to control business opportunities for ESPs and to maintain the local monopoly bottleneck.

39. Industry issues and problems concerning Bellcore or other technical documents presented for resolution can be arbitrarily dismissed by the RBOCs if they are inconsistent with RBOCs' business objectives and/or strategic plans.

---

<sup>18/</sup> Bellcore announces new Generic Requirements process, Bellcore Digest, June, 1993.

Control of the de-facto standards setting process provides the convenience of ultimate control of what technical designs are made available.

40. An example of the RBOCs acting in an arbitrary and discriminatory manner concerns the issuance of Screen List Editing (SLE) service requirements in 1994. The SLE service provides end-users with the ability to change a switch resident table, which controls various call management features, for example, selective call acceptance or call rejection. Non-call associated SS7 signaling messages are used to facilitate this functionality. In the revised Bellcore document (TA-NWT-000220, Issue 4), the RBOCs extended the SLE service on an interLATA basis, and specified that the routing of the SS7 messages would be transported via a network chosen by the RBOC, and not based on equal access presubscription. Equal access presubscription would utilize the "Intermediate Signaling Network Identification" (ISNI) capability.

41. The RBOCs slow rolled the development of ISNI at Committee T1. However, after years of delay, they finally decided not to oppose it any longer. The RBOCs also eventually stopped opposing inclusion of ISNI in Bellcore's generic requirements documents. Hence, it would seem reasonable to expect that they intended to implement ISNI for services which would enable the routing of non-call associated signaling messages across network boundaries. However, the RBOCs



arbitrarily determined that the SLE service would not utilize ISNI when they issued revised interLATA Bellcore requirements for SLE.

42. Moreover, when MCI brought the SLE issue to the attention of the ICCF #30 in November, 1993 requesting that the requirements be further revised to include routing of the interLATA messages based on equal access, the RBOCs refused to accept the issue on the grounds that the routing of these messages was based, and ought to be based, on the RBOCs' business decisions. A second request by MCI to address this issue was brought to ICCF #31 in March, 1994 by demonstrating how the Modified Final Judgment (MFJ) applied to this issue. The RBOCs again refused to address the issue, and stated that "they consider the routing of internetwork interLATA non-call setup to be official communications and thus a business policy decision the LEC is entitled to make."<sup>19/</sup> Subsequent attempts at the ICCF and CLC<sup>20/</sup> to create an industry agreement to define "official communications" were also unsuccessful and refused consideration by the RBOCs. This is another example of the RBOCs dominating the industry consensus process and controlling the de-facto design of the interconnected networks and supported services. The power of their collective opposition prevented the issue from even being considered, thus

---

<sup>19/</sup>ICCF meeting record, ICCF #31, March 16-17, 1994, page 352.

<sup>20/</sup>ICCF #32 meeting, July, 1994 and CLC meeting, September, 1994.